

Non-holonomicity of the sequence $\log 1, \log 2, \log 3, \dots$

Martin Klazar*

February 1, 2008

Abstract

Gerhold conjectured and proved conditionally that $(\log n)_{n \geq 1}$ is not a holonomic sequence. Flajolet, Gerhold and Salvy gave a proof using an analytic machinery. We give a simple proof.

A sequence of complex numbers $(a_n)_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathbf{C}$ is called *holonomic* (P-recursive, D-finite) if there exist polynomials $p_i(x) \in \mathbf{C}[x]$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, d$, which are not all zero and

$$p_d(n)a_{n+d} + \dots + p_1(n)a_{n+1} + p_0(n)a_n = 0 \quad \text{for every integer } n \geq 1. \quad (1)$$

It can be proved that if $(a_n)_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathbf{R}$, the polynomials p_i can be taken with real coefficients as well, and the same is true for the field $\mathbf{Q}$ of rationals (which is the case in enumerative applications). Therefore, since we consider the real sequence $(\log n)_{n \geq 1}$, without loss of generality we can restrict the polynomials in (1) to $\mathbf{R}[x]$ (but not to $\mathbf{Q}[x]$). For the importance of holonomic sequences in combinatorial enumeration and for further information see the book [3] of Stanley.

Gerhold [2] used Schanuel's conjecture to prove that $(\log n)_{n \geq 1}$ is not holonomic and asked about an unconditional proof. Such proof was recently given by Flajolet, Gerhold and Salvy in [1] and is based on the equivalence saying that $(a_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is holonomic iff the generating function $\sum_{n \geq 1} a_n x^n$ satisfies a linear differential equation with polynomial coefficients. The authors further apply a theorem characterizing asymptotic behavior of solutions of such equations near singularity and

*Institute for Theoretical Computer Science and Department of Applied Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Malostranské náměstí 25, 118 00 Praha, Czech Republic. ITI is supported by the project 1M0021620808 of the Czech Ministry of Education. Email: klazar@kam.mff.cuni.cz

an Abelian theorem on transfer of the asymptotics of a sequence to its generating function.

In this note we give a simple proof of their result that $(\log n)_{n \geq 1}$ is not holonomic, that is, the sequence $a_n = \log n$ satisfies no nontrivial relation (1). We prove a somewhat stronger statement. (Recall that all polynomials and rational functions here have real coefficients.)

Theorem. *Let $b_0 = 0 < b_1 < \dots < b_d$ be real numbers and $p_0(x), p_1(x), \dots, p_d(x)$ be polynomials, not all of them zero. The function*

$$F(x) = \sum_{i=0}^d p_i(x) \log(x + b_i)$$

has only finitely many positive real zeros. In particular, $(\log n)_{n \geq 1}$ is not holonomic.

Proof. First we suppose that $F(x) = 0$ for every $x > 0$ and derive a contradiction. We may assume that p_0 is nonzero. Let $m \geq 0$ be minimum such that $p_0^{(m)}(0) = c \neq 0$. Differentiating m times the equation $F(x) = 0$, we obtain that

$$F^{(m)}(x) = u(x) + s(x) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^d p_i^{(m)}(x) \log(x + b_i) + p_0^{(m)}(x) \log x \right) + s(x) = 0$$

for every $x > 0$, where in the rational function $s(x)$ we have collected all terms $q(x)/(x + b_i)^k$ with $q(x) \in \mathbf{R}[x]$ arising in the differentiation ($s(x) = 0$ if there is no such term). Note that 0 is not a pole of $s(x)$ (even if it were, the following argument would still work) and that $s(x)$ has no real positive pole. $F^{(m)}(x)$ is defined for every $x > 0$. For $x \rightarrow 0^+$ we have $|u(x)| \sim |c| \cdot \log(1/x) \rightarrow \infty$ but $s(x)$ is bounded. This contradicts the equality $u(x) + s(x) = 0$ for all $x > 0$.

Now let $F(x_j) = 0$ for an infinite sequence $0 < x_1 < x_2 < \dots$ (or $x_1 > x_2 > \dots > 0$). We consider the derivatives $F', F'', \dots, F^{(M+1)}$ where M is the largest degree of p_i . Clearly, $F^{(M+1)}$ is a rational function. Note that all these derivatives are defined for every $x > 0$. Applying Rolle's theorem (it says that if f is continuous on $[a, b]$, has derivative on (a, b) , and $f(a) = f(b)$, then $f'(c) = 0$ for some $c \in (a, b)$), we obtain that each derivative of F has infinitely many positive real zeros as well. Since every nonzero rational function has only finitely many zeros, $F^{(M+1)}$ must be identically zero. Thus $F^{(M)}$ is constant and identically zero. The same holds for all previous derivatives and we conclude that F is identically zero (for $x > 0$). But we have shown that this is not possible. $\square$

It can be shown very quickly that (1) with $a_n = \log n$ cannot be satisfied with *rational* polynomials p_i . Let us suppose there is such relation. We multiply it by

an integer to clear out denominators and get integral polynomials. Then we apply exponential function and get the relation

$$\frac{\prod_{i \in I} (n + i)^{q_i(n)}}{\prod_{i \in J} (n + j)^{q_i(n)}} = 1 \quad (2)$$

where I and J are disjoint subsets of $\{0, 1, \dots, d\}$, not both empty (for empty set the corresponding product is defined to be 1), and every $q_i(x)$ is a nonzero integral polynomial with positive leading coefficient. We take the largest element of $I \cup J$, let it be $a \in I$. For sufficiently large $n \in \mathbf{N}$ all values $q_i(n)$ are positive integers. We take such an n with the property that $n + a = p$ is a prime. Then the numerator and the denominator in (2) are positive integers such that the former is divisible by p but the latter is not. They cannot cancel out as required by the 1 on the right side and we have a contradiction.

Concluding remarks. Almost all proofs of non-holonomicity of sequences work with their generating functions, the exceptions being [2] and the present note. Our proof suggests another analytic method for non-holonomicity proofs that is applicable when $a_n = f(n)$ for sufficiently smooth function $f(x)$. Instead of the generating function, one can take directly (1) which implies that

$$F(x) = \sum_{i=0}^d p_i(x) f(x + i)$$

has infinitely many positive zeros. By Rolle's theorem, so has each derivative of F . Then one can try to bring this to contradiction. For example, this approach should work for $a_n = n^\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \mathbf{Z}$ (another sequence considered in [1] and [2]).

References

- [1] P. Flajolet, S. Gerhold and B. Salvy, On the non-holonomic character of logarithms, powers, and the n th prime function, arXiv:math. CO/0501379.
- [2] S. Gerhold, On some non-holonomic sequences, *Electr. J. Combinatorics* **11** (2004), R87, 8 pages.
- [3] R. P. Stanley, *Enumerative Combinatorics. Volume II*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 1999.